

## **8.0 LAND USE AND MANAGEMENT**

Land use in the immediate project area is dominated by forest management activities and recreation. Downstream land uses include residential, commercial, and municipal elements. This section focuses on land management activities directed by the Plumas National Forest (PNF) and consistency with local general plans, while recreation is addressed separately in Section 11.

### **8.1 Environmental Setting/Affected Environment**

The environmental setting begins with a description of existing land uses of grazing and forest management and the Forest Service plan requirements. It concludes with a discussion of Plumas County and City of Portola general plans.

#### **8.1.1 Existing Land Uses**

In addition to recreation use described in Section 11 of this EIR/EIS, the project area is used for grazing and for forest management activities.

##### **8.1.1.1 Grazing**

There are three active grazing allotments in the project area: the Grizzly Valley Community, Grizzly Valley, and Humbug allotments (PNF 2006d, p. 3–325).

- The Grizzly Valley Community allotment is located approximately four miles west of Lake Davis. The allotment consists of 12,169 acres and has a stocking rate of 277 cow-calf pairs. The allotment has two permittees with a three-pasture rotation system and is active from June 16 to September 15. The Grizzly Valley Community allotment is fenced so that cattle do not have access to Lake Davis, but they do have access to Big Grizzly Creek and Oldhouse Creek.
- The Grizzly Valley allotment is located west and southwest of Lake Davis. The allotment consists of 12,376 acres and has a stocking rate of 505 cow-calf pairs. The allotment has one permittee with a three-pasture rotation system and is active from June 16 to September 15. Cattle in the Grizzly Valley allotment have access to Lake Davis, Big Grizzly Creek, Freeman Creek, Cow Creek, and Oldhouse Creek.
- The Humbug allotment is located south of Lake Davis. The allotment consists of 3,706 acres and has a stocking rate of 95 cow-calf pairs. The allotment has one permittee and is active from June 1 to August 1. The Humbug allotment is fenced so that cattle do not have access to Lake Davis or any of its major tributaries.

##### **8.1.1.2 Forest Management Activities**

On-going forest management projects are occurring primarily to the west of the lake. Project purposes include reduce hazardous fuels in the wildland urban intermix (WUI) and to create a strategic network of fuel treatment areas known as Defensible Fuel Profile Zones (DFPZs), to improve forest health and bald eagle habitat, to contribute to local community stability, to improve aspen stands, to improve the transportation system. The largest current project is the Freeman Project area that is approximately 15,000 acres on Plumas National Forest (PNF)

lands managed by the Beckwourth Ranger District and located on the west side of Lake Davis. Firewood is cut and gathered by the public under a permit system. Collection is focused within 150 feet of roads. There are no water conveyance or utility lines on NFS lands within the project area. There are no active mining operations on NFS lands within the project area.

### 8.1.2 Regulatory Environment

The majority of lands within the immediate project area are administered by the U. S. Forest Service (USFS). There are Plumas County lands within the project area below Grizzly Valley Dam. The City of Portola's General Plan Study Area is also relevant given the city's close proximity to Lake Davis.

Specifically, the National Forest lands are under the jurisdiction of the Beckwourth Ranger District of the PNF. Management actions and land allocations are set forth by PNF Land and Resource Management Plan (LRMP) (USFS 1988), as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) Supplemental EIS (USFS 2004). General management prescriptions are discussed below, followed by a more detailed discussion of the SNFPA prescriptions, standards, and guidelines. Plumas County and City of Portola general plans discussions follow the Forest Service sections.

#### 8.1.2.1 Forest Service Plan Requirements for Project Area

##### Plumas National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan

The PNF LRMP allocated all PNF lands in various management prescriptions. The Lake Davis Recreation Area is within the "Recreation Area Prescription" allocation described in Section 11.1.1.1 of this EIR/EIS. Plan elements for the Recreation Area are listed in the table below.

**Table 8.1-1. Relevant LRMP Elements for the Recreation Area Prescription**

General Direction	Standards and Guidelines
Visual – maintain high visual quality objectives (VQOs)	Meet mapped, adopted VQO's (see Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines) which vary from site to site.
Cultural Resources – protect and interpret significant resources	Develop interpretive exhibits at appropriate sites that typify cultures, lifestyles, and events of the Northern Sierra.
Range – subordinate livestock grazing to recreation use, also refer to SNFPA SEIS	Locate salt and watering sources away from areas of significant recreation use.
Lands – acquire lands crucial to recreation management	Acquire those lands necessary to protect visual quality, open space, and recreation developments and activities, or encourage private landowners to provide compatible recreation developments for public purposes.

*Source: PNF Land and Resource Management Plan (1988)*

## Relevant SNFPA Plan Elements

The SNFPA Record of Decision (ROD) was signed in January 2001. The SNFPA was prepared to address five problems by doing the following:

- Protect, increase, and perpetuate old forest ecosystems and provide for the viability of native plant and animal species associated with old forest ecosystems;
- Protect and restore aquatic, riparian, and meadow ecosystems and provide for the viability of native plant and animal species associated with these ecosystems;
- Manage fire and fuels in a consistent manner across the national forests, coordinate management strategies with other ownerships, integrate fire and fuels management objectives with other natural resource management objectives, address the role of wildland fire, and set priorities for fire and fuels management actions;
- Reduce and, where possible, reverse the spread of noxious weeds; and
- Maintain and enhance hardwood forest ecosystems on the lower west side of the Sierra Nevada.

In response to a need for greater flexibility with regard to recreation and grazing land uses during project implementation, the SNFPA Supplemental EIS (SEIS) was completed in 2004, and amended the original SNFPA EIS.

The SNFPA established land allocations in response to the above five problems, as well as management strategies and standards and guidelines for each land allocation area. These allocations remained unchanged after the ROD was signed for the SEIS. The land allocations include:

- Wilderness Areas and Wild and Scenic Rivers;
- Inventoried Roadless Areas;
- California Spotted Owl Protected Activity Centers;
- Northern Goshawk Protected Activity Centers;
- Great Grey Owl Protected Activity Centers;
- Forest Carnivore Den Sites;
- Old Forest Emphasis Areas;
- California Spotted Owl Home Range Core Areas;
- Southern Sierra Fisher Conservation Areas;
- Wildland Urban Intermix Zone: Defense Zone;
- Wildland Urban Intermix Zone: Threat Zone;
- General Forest;
- Critical Aquatic Refuges;
- Riparian Conservation Areas;

- Yosemite Toad Habitat; and
- Willow Flycatcher.

The project area contains the following land allocations: General Forest, Old Forest, and Riparian Conservation Areas (RCAs), California spotted owl, Great gray owl, and Northern goshawk Protected Activity Centers (PACs) threat and defense, and wildland urban intermix zones. Greater detail on land allocations is provided at the end of this section. A brief overview of Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines is given, followed by specific standards and guidelines.

### **Forest-wide Standards and Guidelines**

In addition to standards and guidelines for terrestrial and aquatic resources, there are standards and guidelines that apply to all land allocations (other than wilderness areas and wild and scenic river areas) unless stated otherwise.

### **Standards and Guidelines for Riparian Conservation Areas and Critical Aquatic Refuges**

Designate RCA widths as described in Part B of the Management Direction Appendix for the SEIS ROD. The RCA widths displayed in Part B may be adjusted at the project level if a landscape analysis has been completed and a site-specific riparian conservation objectives (RCO) analysis demonstrates a need for different widths.

Evaluate new proposed management activities within CARs and RCAs during environmental analysis to determine consistency with the RCOs at the project level and the AMS goals for the landscape. Ensure that appropriate mitigation measures are enacted to (1) minimize the risk of activity-related sediment entering aquatic systems and (2) minimize impacts to habitat for aquatic- or riparian-dependent plant and animal species.

Potential permits, approvals, and consultations needed for with the Proposed Project and action alternatives are discussed in Section 1.2, Project Objectives/Purpose and Need, and more specifically in Table 1.2-1, Potential Permits and Uses. The USFS action for the project is the issuance of a special use permit to the DFG and up to two forest closure orders.

### ***Riparian Conservation Objectives***

#### **Riparian Conservation Objective #1**

Identify the specific beneficial uses for the project area, water quality goals from the Regional Basin Plan, and the manner in which the standards and guidelines will protect the beneficial uses (RCO #1 is linked to the following AMS goals: Water Quality, Species Viability, and Watershed Condition). Ensure that identified beneficial uses for the water body are adequately protected.

**Riparian Conservation Objective #2**

Maintain or restore: (1) the geomorphic and biological characteristics of special aquatic features, including lakes, meadows, bogs, fens, wetlands, vernal pools, and springs; (2) streams, including in-stream flows; and (3) hydrologic connectivity both within and between watersheds to provide for the habitat needs of aquatic-dependent species (RCO #2 is linked to the following AMS Goals: Species Viability, Plant and Animal Community Diversity, Special Habitats, Watershed Connectivity, Floodplains and Water Tables, Streamflow Patterns and Sediment Regimes, and Streambanks, and Shorelines).

**Riparian Conservation Objective #3**

Ensure a renewable supply of large down logs that: (1) can reach the stream channel and (2) provide suitable habitat within and adjacent to the RCA (RCO #3 is linked to the following AMS goals: Species Viability, and Plant and Animal Community Diversity).

**Riparian Conservation Objective #4**

Ensure that management activities, including fuels reduction actions, within RCAs and CARs enhance or maintain physical and biological characteristics associated with aquatic- and riparian-dependent species (RCO #4 is linked to the following AMS Goals: Species Viability and Watershed Condition).

**Riparian Conservation Objective #5**

Preserve, restore, or enhance special aquatic features, such as meadows, lakes, ponds, bogs, fens, and wetlands, to provide the ecological conditions and processes needed to recover or enhance the viability of species that rely on these areas (RCO #5 is linked to the following AMS goals: Water Quality, Species Viability, Plant and Animal Community Diversity, Special Habitats, Watershed Condition, and Stream Banks, and Shorelines).

**Riparian Conservation Objective #6**

Identify and implement restoration actions to maintain, restore or enhance water quality and maintain, restore, or enhance habitat for riparian and aquatic species (RCO # 6 is linked to all AMS goals).

**Riparian Conservation Areas**

RCA widths for perennial streams are described below. RCA widths shown below may be adjusted at the project level if a landscape analysis has been completed and a site-specific RCO analysis demonstrates a need for different widths.

- Perennial Streams: 300 feet on each side of the stream, measured from the bank full edge of the stream;
- Seasonally Flowing Streams (includes intermittent and ephemeral streams): 150 feet on each side of the stream, measured from the bank full edge of the stream;

- Streams in Inner Gorge: top of inner gorge;
- Special aquatic features or perennial streams with riparian conditions extending more than 150 feet from edge of streambank or seasonally flowing streams with riparian conditions extending more than 50 feet from edge of streambank: 300 feet from edge of feature or riparian vegetation, whichever width is greater; and
- Other hydrological or topographic depressions without a defined channel: RCA width and protection measures determined through project level analysis.

### SNFPA Land Allocations

The project area overlaps with the following other land allocations:

- Riparian Conservation Areas (includes information for willow flycatcher habitat);
- Great Gray Owl Protected Activity Centers;
- Spotted Owl and Northern Goshawk Protected Activity Centers;
- Wildland Urban Intermix: Defense Zone; and,
- Wildland Urban Intermix: Threat Zone.

Table 8.2-1 displays the acreage of each allocation within the project area. The south end of the project area is occupied by WUI land allocations (2,690 acres). RCAs comprise 834 acres, and are found along Freeman, Cow, and Big Grizzly creeks. PACs are also found within the project area on the west side of Lake Davis, with some overlap along Big Grizzly, Freeman, Cow, and Oldhouse creeks.

**Table 8.2-1. Allocations and Acreage**

Allocation	Acres
<b>Protected Activity Centers</b>	
Great Gray Owl	171
California Spotted Owl	2,216
Northern Goshawk	1,099
<b>Riparian Conservation Areas</b>	
Big Grizzly Creek	305
Freeman Creek	300
Cow Creek	229
<b>Wildland Urban Intermix / Fire Protection Zones</b>	
Defense Zone	593
Threat Zone	2,097

Additional discussion on RCAs may be found in Surface Water Resources (Section 3.1.1.3). Additional discussion on Great gray owl, Spotted owl, and Northern goshawk PACs may also be found in the Wildlife Resources (Section 7.2.1.4). Visual Resources are discussed in Section 9, Aesthetic Resources, and Section 11, Recreation.

### 8.1.2.2 Plumas County General Plan

The Plumas County General Plan was adopted in 1981, and has been amended numerous times, the most recent being 2004. The Plan provides goals for protection and utilization of resources. The base land use map for the plan establishes resource areas and development areas. Maximum density in the different development areas (residential, commercial, industrial, and multiple family) may be reduced by overlaying mitigable constraints over locations of specific projects. Mitigable constraints reflect plan goals, which must be addressed, and normally require modification in development standards and siting of structures.

Of relevance to the Proposed Project is the mitigable constraint of Sensitive Water Areas, which includes lakes, rivers, and streams. Sensitive water areas apply to the portion of Big Grizzly Creek below Lake Davis. The Plan specifies that sensitive water areas should be identified and “shall include important fish and wildlife habitat, surface waters and watersheds which are sources of water supplies, and recreation water areas” (Plumas County General Plan, 2004, p. 14). Projects that could affect Sensitive Water Areas “require erosion control and runoff evaluations for all developments so as to ensure maintenance of water quality and fish and wildlife habitat” (Plumas County General Plan, 2004, p. 14).

The portion of the project on lands under the jurisdiction of Plumas County is zoned for suburban and secondary suburban land uses. In addition to residential areas along Grizzly Creek, there is the Walton’s Grizzly Lodge, and Grizzly Creek Ranch. Walton’s Grizzly Lodge is a children’s summer camp, and Grizzly Creek Ranch is a camp that focuses on children with special needs. The Grizzly Ranch Development Project ([www.grizzlyranch.com](http://www.grizzlyranch.com)) is currently in one of the construction phases. Located on 1,000 acres, the development will have 380 homes. It also will have a network of hiking/walking trails and an 18-hole golf course.

### 8.1.2.3 City of Portola General Plan

The City of Portola’s General Plan 2020 ([http://www.ci.portola.ca.us/general\\_plan.htm](http://www.ci.portola.ca.us/general_plan.htm)) is a comprehensive update to the General Plan that was adopted in 1992. The General Plan examines three geographic areas: the current City boundary, the current Sphere of Influence boundary, and a General Plan Study Area boundary. The city itself only occupies about two square miles. However, the Study Area occupies 17 square miles, and could possibly overlap with the Big Grizzly Creek portion of the project area below Lake Davis.

Of most relevance to the Proposed Project is the Open Space and Conservation Element. It contains goals and policies for Soil Erosion, Water Quality, Open Space, Biological Resources, and Archaeological Resources that are reproduced below. Water supply and distribution policies are contained in the Public Services and Facilities Element.

### Soil Erosion

Preserve and maintain the City of Portola’s soils to avoid pollution of the Feather River and its tributaries and loss of soil.

## Water Quality

Maintain water quality in the City of Portola surface and ground waters.

In addition to this goal, the Plan contains a policy about maintaining water quality in tributaries to the Middle Fork Feather River.

- **WC-P-3:** Maintain a high level of water quality in the Feather River and tributary areas.

## Water Supply and Distribution

Pertinent policies include the following:

- **PF-P-5:** Secure sufficient sources of water to meet the needs of the existing community and planned growth.
- **PF-P-8:** City water service will not be extended to unincorporated areas unless an adequate supply is available for all areas within the city.
- **PF-P-12:** Monitor water quality regularly and take necessary measures to prevent contamination.
- **PF-I-5:** The city will continue to identify and secure water supplies from groundwater sources, and consider utilization of Lake Davis water.

## Open Space

Maintain open space as a key feature of the City of Portola. In addition to this goal, there are several implementation guidelines that apply to this project.

- **OS-I-1:** Where feasible, integrate creekside greenways with the City of Portola's open space system and encourage public access to creek corridors.
- **OS-I-7:** Cooperate with private open space preservation groups such as the Nature Conservancy, private land owners and developers, and other public agencies, such as Plumas County and the U.S. Forest Service, to permanently set aside and protect open space areas that are significant to the environmental quality and identity of the City of Portola. Such open space areas include the Wild and Scenic Middle Fork Feather River and its major tributaries in the City of Portola, the Charles Creek Meadow, the meadow along Highway 70 at Grizzly Creek Road, and the meadow areas along Highway 70 downstream of the Portola pump station.

## Biological Resources

Protect and maintain all biological resources in the City of Portola area.

## Archaeological, Cultural, and Historic Resources

Protect archaeological, historic, and paleontological resources for their aesthetic, educational, and cultural values.



## 8.2 Environmental Impacts and Consequences

### 8.2.1 Evaluation Criteria and Environmental Concerns

Impacts of the Proposed Project on land use were evaluated by determining whether the Proposed Project followed Standards and Guidelines set forth in the SNFPA. Furthermore, significant impacts of the Proposed Project on land use were evaluated using the following CEQA environmental checklist criteria. A project would have a significant effect if it would:

- Physically divide an established community;
- Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect; or
- Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan.

There are three active grazing allotments within the project area; Grizzly Valley Community, Grizzly Valley, and Humbug. Three possible areas of concern for grazing, associated with the Proposed Project, are; the effects of the treatment on cattle drinking water, drinking water sources during reservoir drawdown, and fencing.

- First, toxicology assessments have determined that the amount of rotenone ingested through the daily amount of drinking water typically consumed by cattle is well below acceptable levels. Hazard quotients under a variety of risk assessment scenarios are all less than one (Appendix J). Therefore, the waters of Lake Davis and its tributaries would be safe for consumption by cattle during the Proposed Project;
- Second, primary drinking water sources for the cattle are from creeks and tributaries within the Lake Davis watershed. Cattle within the Grizzly Valley allotment are the only cattle that have access to Lake Davis. Even with access to the reservoir, cattle within that allotment use creeks as their primary water source. Therefore, drawdown of the reservoir should not be a concern as far as an impact to the cattle's water source; and,
- Finally, fencing contains cattle to each allotment. Fencing for the Grizzly Valley allotment extends into Lake Davis far enough so that cattle are contained even at low pool levels. If reservoir drawdown falls below where the current fencing extends, there is the possibility of cattle in the Grizzly Valley allotment being able to get around the current fencing.

Forest management concerns include the overlap of forest projects within the project area. The objective of the proposed Freeman Project is to reduce hazardous fuels in the WUI and to create a strategic network of fuel treatment areas to improve forest health and bald eagle habitat. The Freeman Project is located south and southwest of Lake Davis and would overlap with the pike eradication projects in both project area and timeframe. Concerns about these projects coinciding include traffic and worker safety.

Great gray owl, California spotted owl, and northern goshawk PACs are all intersected by major tributaries of the Lake Davis watershed within the project area. Impacts to PACs are addressed in Wildlife Resources, Section 7.2.1.4.

Firewood cutting permits are issued in the Lake Davis area of the PNF. These permits allow cutting of dead trees and snags within 100 feet of roads. Access to some areas would need to be restricted during any treatment of Lake Davis and its tributaries during the Proposed Project. A forest closure would restrict access for up to six weeks in order to protect human health and safety.

### **8.2.2 Evaluation Methods and Assumptions**

The following assumptions affect the evaluation of impacts on land use from the project alternatives:

Toxicology assessments have determined that the amount of rotenone ingested through the daily amount of drinking water typically consumed by cattle is well below acceptable levels. Hazard quotients under a variety of risk assessment scenarios are all less than one (Appendix J, Section J.2.14). Therefore, the waters of Lake Davis and its tributaries would be safe for consumption by cattle during the rotenone treatment.

- Grazing allotments would be active during the treatment of the reservoir and its tributaries;
- There would be an overlap implementing the Proposed Project and the Freeman Project, the same roadways would be used for these projects, and treatment areas may overlap;
- There would be a forest closure that would prohibit human entry into National Forest System lands and roads in the vicinity of rotenone storage and application sites, including the reservoir and tributary streams; and,
- No new roadways would be constructed for the project alternatives.

### **8.2.3 No Project/No Action**

The No Project alternative represents the continuation of existing land management practices, including pike population control and pike containment within the reservoir. The land use impact of No Project would be how it affects the reservoir as a trout fishing area. Effects on trout fishing and other recreational activities are discussed in Recreation Resources, Section 11.2. Cattle grazing and forest management projects such as the Freeman Project would continue. Because existing activities would continue under No Project, there would be no impact.

### **8.2.4 Proposed Project/Proposed Action – 15,000 Acre-Feet (Plus Treatment)**

Potential impacts to land use from the Proposed Project center around grazing and forest management activities. Reservoir drawdown to 15,000 acre-feet could have potential impacts on the management of grazing allotments within the project area by affecting fencing and adjacent pastures. Coinciding projects within the PNF (Proposed Project and Freeman

Project) could also raise forest management concerns. The following impacts are related to these two areas:

#### **8.2.4.1 Cattle Grazing and Containment**

When reservoir levels are low, current fencing may not contain cattle to the appropriate pastures. Cattle could move to the next pasture in rotation, which would be a violation of the permittee's annual operating instructions. This situation could apply to about 500 cow-calf pairs that utilize the Grizzly Valley Allotment.

**Impact LU-1: Containment of cattle in the Grizzly Valley allotment as reservoir drawdown falls below the current fence extending into Lake Davis. This adverse impact is significant but mitigable.**

Mitigation LU-1: The DFG shall contribute materials and labor to the appropriate range allotment permittees to construct additional fencing to keep cows from moving to other pastures.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

#### **8.2.4.2 Coordination with Freeman Project**

The Freeman Project would begin in spring 2007 and continue until spring 2008 (Stabler, personal communication 2006). During project implementation, timber harvest operators could use the same areas for staging along the three major tributaries to Lake Davis as the Proposed Project.

The Freeman Project would begin in spring 2007 and continue until spring 2008. During project implementation timber harvest operators could use the same areas for staging along the three major tributaries to Lake Davis as the pike eradication project. Contractors conducting activities associated with the Freeman Project could be exempted from the Public Health and Safety Forest Closure because their activities are controllable via their contracts are regularly monitored by forest service sale administrators, and are vital for the health of NFS lands. Their activities would be coordinated with eradication activities on a daily basis to ensure public and worker health and safety. Part of the Freeman Project calls for mechanical treatment of aspen stands, which could overlap with staging areas for treatment of the three major tributaries to Lake Davis. The DFG crews could be exposed to safety hazards (timber harvesting) if they are in these same areas as timber harvest operators. Similarly, timber harvest operators could be exposed to rotenone and its constituents such as naphthalene, creating a potential safety issue. Additionally, there would be safety hazards when there is timber harvesting along roads used to access the three major tributaries for placing the rotenone drip stations.

**Impact LU-2: Overlap in project areas and traffic from the Proposed Project and Freeman Project is a significant but mitigable adverse impact.**

Mitigation LU-2a: The DFG shall obtain a detailed work schedule from the Forest Service timber sale layout coordinator for the Freeman Creek project. The schedule will identify the treatment units and roads in which timber harvest operators will be working.

Mitigation LU-2b: The DFG shall provide or arrange for traffic control during times when there is timber harvesting along roads used by DFG crews.

Significance After Mitigation: Less than significant.

#### **8.2.4.3 Consistency with Federal Plans**

Analyses of effects conducted throughout this EIR/EIS reveal no inconsistencies with the PNF LRMP or SNFPA.

**Impact LU-3: The Proposed Project would be consistent with SNFPA, and there would be no impact.**

#### **8.2.4.4 Consistency with Local Plans**

Regarding the Plumas County General Plan, this alternative would be consistent with the mitigable constraint of sensitive water areas. Big Grizzly Creek is considered a sensitive water area, and as a result an evaluation of erosion control and runoff and their effects on water quality and fish and wildlife habitat must be conducted. Evaluation of the effects on water quality is found in Section 3, and an evaluation of the effects on fish and wildlife habitat is found in Section 7.

The Proposed Project would be consistent with the City of Portola General Plan guidelines (refer to Section 8.1.3) for protecting open space areas. The outstandingly remarkable values (ORVs) associated with the Wild and Scenic Middle Fork Feather River would be maintained, as described in Recreation Resources (Section 11.2).

The City of Portola General Plan guideline W-C-P-3 states that high water quality will be maintained in the Middle Fork Feather River and its tributaries, and Section 8.4 discusses the need to protect water quality from the effects of urbanization. The Proposed Project would cause short-term significant and unavoidable impacts by elevating turbidity, creating anoxic conditions in Lake Davis earlier in the summer compared to No Project, and would cause elevated water temperature and reduced dissolved oxygen in Big Grizzly Creek. However, the General Plan was prepared to guide long-term physical development and minimize associated impacts for the City of Portola. California Code Section 65300 requires the General Plan to have this long-range perspective, which for the City of Portola's Plan is until 2020. Unlike physical development associated with urbanization, the Proposed Project would only create short-term, temporary impacts that would not physically divide developed areas of the City. Therefore, the Proposed Project is consistent with City of Portola General Plan 2020.

**Impact LU 4: The Proposed Project would be consistent with the Plumas County General Plan and the City of Portola General Plan, and there would be no impact.**

#### **8.2.4.5 Firewood Collection**

Ongoing firewood collection occurs along roadways within the PNF. Wood cutters would not be able to collect firewood in the project area during the proposed area forest closure, which

could last for up to 45 days. Other roads would be available to access in other parts of the forest before and after closure.

**Impact LU-5: The impact to firewood collection is adverse but less than significant given the opportunity to collect firewood on other roads in the PNF.**

### **8.2.5 Alternative A – 15,000 Acre-Feet Plus Treatment (Including Powder)**

Impact LU-1: Impact and mitigation are the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-2: Impact and mitigation are the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-3: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-4: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-5: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

### **8.2.6 Alternative B – 5,000 Acre-Feet (Plus Treatment)**

Impact LU-1: Impact and mitigation are similar to the Proposed Project/Proposed Action, but additional fencing may be required.

Impact LU-2: Impact and mitigation are the same as Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-3: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-4: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-5: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

### **8.2.7 Alternative C – 35,000 Acre-Feet (Plus Treatment)**

Impact LU-1: Impact and mitigation are similar to the Proposed Project/Proposed Action, but less fencing may be required.

Impact LU-2: Impact and mitigation are the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-3: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-4: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-5: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

### **8.2.8 Alternative D – 48,000 Acre-Feet (Plus Treatment)**

Impact LU-1: With maintenance of the reservoir at 48,000 acre-feet, similar to present conditions, there is no impact on containment of cattle.

Impact LU-2: Impact and mitigation are the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-3: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-4: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-5: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

### 8.2.9 **Alternative E – Dewater Reservoir and Tributaries (No Chemical Treatment)**

Impact LU-1: Impact and mitigation are similar to the Proposed Project/Proposed Action, but additional fencing would be required to contain cattle to the appropriate pasture.

Impact LU-2: Impact and mitigation are similar to the Proposed Project/Proposed Action. Traffic associated with dewatering would occur to install dewatering pumps and pipelines.

Impact LU-3: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-4: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Impact LU-5: Impact is the same as the Proposed Project/Proposed Action.

Concerning coordination with the PNF's Freeman Project, there is an additional impact. Complete dewatering of the three major tributaries to Lake Davis would force timber harvest operators to find and pump from an alternate source of water for their water tending devices. These water tending devices are needed per timber sale contract requirements for dust abatement along project roads, and for potential wildfire suppression.

**Impact LU-6: Dewatering tributaries would have an adverse impact on the need for adequate water supply for timber operators' water tending devices. This adverse impact is significant but mitigable.**

Mitigation LU-6a: The DFG shall implement Mitigation LU-2a.

Mitigation LU-6b: The DFG shall implement Mitigation LU-2b.

Mitigation LU-6c: The DFG shall work with the timber sale layout coordinator for the Freeman Project and find an alternate source of water on the west side of Lake Davis for the water tending devices, such as a temporary water tank.

### 8.2.10 **Cumulative Impacts**

Based on the known past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects listed in Section 1.8, there are no cumulative impacts associated with land use for the Proposed Project.

#### 8.2.10.1 **Analysis Area**

The analysis area for cumulative impacts of land uses and plans is the Lake Davis watershed. This includes lands along the major tributaries to Lake Davis (Big Grizzly, Freeman, and Cow Creeks) and Big Grizzly Creek below Lake Davis.

#### 8.2.10.2 **Projects Evaluated**

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects were evaluated in terms of their effects on grazing, transportation, and consistency with Forest Service plans and the Plumas County General Plan. Projects include the following:

- Watershed Restoration projects, Freeman and Cow creeks, 1980–2000
- Westside Lake Davis Watershed restoration project, 2005–06

- Grizzly Ranch Development Project, ongoing
- Humbug, Grizzly Valley, Grizzly Community, and Lake Davis grazing allotments, ongoing
- DWR Containment Project, 2006
- Forest Service Road 24N10 chip seal project, unscheduled
- Freeman Project, scheduled for 2007
- Cutoff project, planning in 2007
- Mt. Ingalls project, planning in 2007

#### **8.2.10.3 Proposed Project**

The Proposed Project would not result in cumulative impacts. None of the above projects in combination with the Proposed Project would cause impacts to grazing operations, and stocking levels on grazing allotments in the analysis area have been relatively stable the last several years. Nor would there be long-term impacts to traffic on roads within the analysis area. Finally all of the above projects would be consistent with either the PNF plans or the Plumas County General Plan, depending on project location.

#### **8.2.10.4 Alternative A**

Alternative A would not result in cumulative impacts for the same reasons cited above.

#### **8.2.10.5 Alternative B**

Alternative B would not result in cumulative impacts. None of the above projects in combination with the Proposed Project would cause impacts to grazing operations, and stocking levels on grazing allotments in the analysis area have been relatively stable the last several years. Nor would there be long-term impacts to traffic on roads within the analysis area. Finally all of the above projects would be consistent with either the PNF plans or the Plumas County General Plan, depending on project location.

#### **8.2.10.6 Alternative C**

Alternative C would not result in cumulative impacts. None of the above projects in combination with the Proposed Project would cause impacts to grazing operations, and stocking levels on grazing allotments in the analysis area have been relatively stable the last several years. Nor would there be long-term impacts to traffic on roads within the analysis area. Finally all of the above projects would be consistent with either the PNF plans or the Plumas County General Plan, depending on project location.

#### **8.2.10.7 Alternative D**

Alternative D would not result in cumulative impacts. None of the above projects in combination with the Proposed Project would cause impacts to grazing operations, and

stocking levels on grazing allotments in the analysis area have been relatively stable the last several years. Nor would there be long-term impacts to traffic on roads within the analysis area. Finally all of the above projects would be consistent with either the PNF plans or the Plumas County General Plan, depending on project location.

#### **8.2.10.8 Alternative E**

Alternative E would not result in cumulative impacts. None of the above projects in combination with Proposed Project would cause impacts to grazing operations, and stocking levels on grazing allotments in the analysis area have been relatively stable the last several years. Nor would there be long-term impacts to traffic on roads within the analysis area. Finally all of the above projects would be consistent with either the PNF plans or the Plumas County General Plan, depending on project location.

#### **8.2.10.9 Environmental Impacts Summary**

Table 8.3-1 summarizes impacts to land resources. Impacts to forest management and traffic and worker safety concerns remain constant to all alternatives involving treatment. For grazing, fencing concerns increase as reservoir levels fall below current low pool levels and are directly related to how far down the reservoir is dewatered. For effects of forest management (Freeman Project) and the Proposed Project on traffic and worker safety concerns, No Project would have no impact, and the Proposed Project and Alternatives A, B, C, D, and E would have impacts that would be adverse and significant but mitigable to less than significant levels. For fencing concerns, No Project and Alternative D would have no impact, and the Proposed Project and Alternatives A, B, C, and E would have adverse and significant but mitigable impacts that would increase with lower reservoir levels.



**Table 8.3-1. Summary Comparison of Impacts of Alternatives**

Affected Resource and Area of Potential Impact	Alternative						
	No Project Compared to Existing Conditions	Proposed Action	A	B	C	D	E
<b>Land Use</b>							
1. Exposed gap in fencing with Lake Davis drawdown	N	SM, A	SM, A	SM, A	SM, A	N	SM, A
2. Traffic overlap and worker safety from Proposed Project and Freeman Project	N	SM, A	SM, A	SM, A	SM, A	SM, A	SM, A
3. Consistency with federal plans	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
4. Consistency with local plans	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
5. Access to firewood in project area	N	LS, A	LS, A	LS, A	LS, A	LS, A	LS, A
6. Coordination with Freeman Project	N	N	N	N	N	N	SM, A

**Key:**

A = Adverse Impact (NEPA)

B = Beneficial Impact (NEPA)

LS = Less than Significant Impact (CEQA)

N = No Impact (CEQA, NEPA)

SM = Significant but Mitigable Impact (CEQA)

SU = Significant and Unavoidable Impact (CEQA)

#### **8.2.11 Monitoring**

Monitoring of cattle grazing and traffic control would be done by PNF personnel.